## Case 1:15-cr-00095-AJN Document 2206 Filed 05/21/18 Page 1 of 73

I43QBURs UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 -----x UNITED STATES OF AMERICA 3 15 CR 95 (AJN) V. 4 Sentence NICO BURRELL 5 Defendant -----x 6 7 New York, N.Y. April 3, 2018 8 3:00 p.m. 9 Before: 10 HON. ALISON J. NATHAN 11 District Judge 12 APPEARANCES 13 GEOFFREY S. BERMAN 14 Interim United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York 15 HAGAN C. SCOTTEN RACHEL MAIMIN 16 Assistant United States Attorney 17 JUDITH VARGAS Attorney for Defendant 18 -and-GEORGE R. GOLTZER 19 Attorney for Defendant -and-20 YING STAFFORD Attorney for Defendant 21 22 23 24 25

(Case called)

MR. SCOTTEN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Hagan Scotten and Rachel Maimin for the government.

MS. MAIMIN: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to you both.

For the defendant.

MS. VARGAS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Judith Vargas and Mr. George Goltzer for Mr. Nico Burrell.

THE COURT: Good afternoon to you both.

And good afternoon, Mr. Burrell.

THE DEFENDANT: Good afternoon.

THE COURT: We are here today for sentencing in United States v. Nico Burrell, 15 CR 95.

In preparation for today's proceeding, I have reviewed the probation report which is dated -- I'm using the amendment date -- December 29, 2017.

In addition, I have received and reviewed the following submissions: I have the defendant's primary submission, which is dated March 27, 2018, and it has the following attachment exhibits: Exhibit A is an extensive mitigation report by Kathleen O'Boyle, and that document has exhibits as well, which I have reviewed. Included in that are a number of historical documents pertaining to Mr. Burrell, as well as an extensive number of letters from family members and loved ones. That all constitutes Exhibit A to the defendant's

1 submission.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Exhibit B is the objections and comments to the presentence report.

Exhibit C includes a number of certificates of achievement and participation.

Exhibit D is a DVD which includes video statements of family members and colleagues.

Then, additionally, from the defense I have a letter dated March 28, 2018 which withdrew some of the remarks, comments, assertions made in the sentencing submission. And then I have a March 30 supplemental submission which includes a letter from Focus Forward, as well as a list of books that Mr. Burrell read.

I should note among the exhibits, the letter exhibits to the O'Boyle report was a letter from Mr. Burrell that I read. And that's what I have from the defense.

From the government, I have its primary submission which is dated March 30, 2018. It too has exhibits. Exhibit A was a video provided.

And Exhibit B which is attached is a transcript from the Moye proceeding, which involves the incident of a witness assault that is discussed and relevant to the sentencing here.

Counsel, is there anything else I should have in front of me for purposes of sentencing?

MR. SCOTTEN: Not from the government, your Honor.

```
MS. VARGAS: Nor for the defense, your Honor.
1
               THE COURT: Can you confirm, please, that you've
 2
 3
      received each other's submissions?
 4
               MR. SCOTTEN: The government has, your Honor.
 5
               MS. VARGAS: Yes, your Honor, from the defense.
 6
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 7
               We will turn first to the presentence report,
8
     Ms. Vargas. I ask this only as a matter of record.
9
               Have you reviewed the presentence report?
10
               MS. VARGAS: Yes, I have, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: And you've discussed it with your client?
12
               MS. VARGAS: Extensively.
13
               THE COURT: Mr. Burrell, you've had a chance to review
14
      the presentence report?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
16
               THE COURT: And raise any issues or concerns with your
17
      counsel?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I have.
19
               THE COURT: For the record, Mr. Scotten, you've
20
      reviewed the presentence report?
21
               MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: We are going to put aside for a moment the
23
      calculation of the Sentencing Guidelines. Ms. Vargas, I want
24
      to ask what continuing objections you have to the presentence
```

report regarding factual accuracy.

25

MS. VARGAS: We have none at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. I do just want to confirm, because obviously there were some that were withdrawn and some that are discussed in the government's sentencing submission, to make sure that I have a full understanding of your position with respect to them.

So one of the issues that's discussed is the question of Mr. Burrell's leadership in BMB. The plea agreement indicated as part of its calculation a leadership enhancement. I had understood your argument in the sentencing submission to be, yes, he has admitted to a leadership, but we still think you should put what's included in the PSR in perspective in understanding that role. Is that a fair reading?

MR. GOLTZER: Your Honor, George Goltzer for
Mr. Burrell. We entered into a series of stipulations after
the conclusion of extensive negotiations with the government in
terms of what would be an appropriate disposition by a
government-defense plea agreement. We are not asking to back
off our position on leadership or the assault situation.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. GOLTZER: However, we have a difference of degree. There's leadership and then there is extensive leadership and mild leadership. We are going to is discuss it in our remarks.

As the stipulations are concerned, we abide by those.

THE COURT: To the extent there are facts contained in

1 the PSR

the PSR that go to -- the factual record from which you'll make those arguments, you don't contest those facts.

MR. GOLTZER: It's a little more nuanced than that, but basically no. I'll be addressing that, and Ms. Vargas will be addressing it, if you permit us, and I think it will become clear there is no need for a Fatico.

THE COURT: That's the primary question. I want to make sure before I adopt the factual recitation set forth in the PSR that there is no request for a Fatico hearing with respect to those facts.

MR. GOLTZER: We intend to mitigate things somewhat, but we're not asking for a Fatico. There is no objection to your accepting the recommendations factually in the presentence report.

THE COURT: And you've discussed these issues with Mr. Burrell?

MR. GOLTZER: Ms. Vargas has done the very heavy lifting. I was learned counsel. We didn't want to duplicate, but she has spent an inordinate amount of time with Mr. Burrell, and I discussed it with him yesterday.

THE COURT: Just to complete the record then,

Ms. Vargas, you've discussed with Mr. Burrell that he would be
entitled to a factual hearing, a Fatico hearing, as it's
called, with respect to any material facts that would affect my
sentencing in such a hearing, it would be the government's

burden to prove those facts by a preponderance of the evidence.

MS. VARGAS: I have, your Honor. We have discussed it.

THE COURT: Mr. Burrell, you're not seeking any sort of Fatico hearing?

THE DEFENDANT: No, ma'am.

THE COURT: Thank you.

I adopt the factual recitations set forth in the PSR. Hearing no objections, the report will be made a part of the record in this matter and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to this, court.

Turning to the guideline calculation. As counsel is aware, I am no longer required to follow the United States

Sentencing Guidelines, but I am still required to consider the applicable guidelines in imposing sentence. I must, therefore, accurately calculate the sentencing guideline range. Here, we do have a discrepancy between the parties' stipulated guideline calculation and the calculation contained in the PSR, and I do want to ask the parties about their view as to the -- I want to make sure I understand the calculation contained in the PSR so that I could make my own evaluation as to the appropriateness of what's included and to the extent I have questions, I would value counsels' honest responses to my question and wouldn't consider any such response a breach of the plea agreement.

And as I understand it, the discrepancy here is that the parties stipulated to an inclusion of an upward departure with a caveat that there was a typo in the plea agreement, based on what I gather was meant to be 5K2.0(a)(2)(A) on the theory that the assault of the witness for a separate federal offense is not otherwise accounted for in the guideline calculation. Is that correct?

MR. SCOTTEN: That is correct, your Honor. I can elaborate, but I think you have it right there.

THE COURT: And probation disagrees with the inclusion of that upward departure on the basis that -- I'm just reading from page 35 of the PSR. "Although the parties included the MCC assault in their guideline calculations, we did not, as the assault took place outside of the operative dates of the instant offense." And probation has included that it is a factor that should be considered pursuant to 3553(a) instead.

So what is the basis -- I mean, it is true that it occurred outside the scope of the offense, obviously, given that it's during pretrial incarceration for the offense. Is it factually related in any way in this case to this charge?

MR. SCOTTEN: It is not factually related, your Honor, in the sense that this assault was not motivated, so far as we know, and we have a sense of what motivated it by any attempt to prevent witnesses from testifying against Mr. Burrell or any other member of this enterprise.

We do think it is related in the sense that, as the Court has become very familiar, BMB has this creed of anti-snitching and it is very much part of being a member of the gang and broader ethos, and this assault was an effort at intimidation by a proponent of that creed who developed it while leading the gang.

At the same time, I should note I'm not sure the Court needs to resolve the legal disagreement, to the extent there is one, between the PSR and the parties, because the whole idea of the relevant guidelines provision essentially is that the parties are stipulating to something that would not perhaps otherwise be included. It gives the Court the authority to say perhaps I would not normally add these three levels, but the parties have agreed here it's relevant. We certainly think it's relevant to the assessment of the defendant's culpability, and the parties agreed it should be included in the analysis. So I think the Court is free to accept that stipulation, not because the Court would come to it independently but because there's a guideline provision that allows the parties to put such stipulations before the Court.

THE COURT: So, I mean, just so I understand it, under that theory, you could put any unrelated -- I mean, anything you deem related, even if sort of subjectively one would deem it unrelated, before the Court, and I should include it in my calculation without any independent assessment of relatedness

in any way?

MR. SCOTTEN: I don't think so, your Honor. I think the Court, as you've already made clear, has to come to it's own calculation, and you can assess the reasonableness of the parties' stipulation. If we entered a stipulation that someone's guidelines should be enhanced for two levels because they're a fan of the wrong sports team, the Court would look at that say, "That's absurd. I'm not going to do it."

Here, I guess what I'm suggesting is the parties stipulation is reasonable. It is not wholly unrelated to the conduct at issue here. Mr. Burrell by his plea accepted it as one of the predicates. It's not something that's unrelated in the sense totally divorced.

THE COURT: You say accepted it as one of the predicates. As part of the stipulated guideline range, not as part of the allocution to the offense.

MR. SCOTTEN: That is correct. And perhaps I should back off from that because the mere fact that it is used to calculate his guidelines does not necessarily make it a predicate. It merely requires that it be relevant conduct.

THE COURT: I guess just at base, what you understand the stipulation to mean is that the parties agreed that it is connected conduct that is not otherwise accounted for in the guideline calculation and therefore appropriately assessed as an enhancement.

I tried to find some authority on the question, and the closest I found was a circuit summary order in a case called *United States v. Robinson*, 428 Fed. Appx. 103. It's, as I said, a summary order, and somewhat comparable circumstances, but it does talk about — it says: The district court did not abuse its discretion in imposing the departure based on violent conduct which was aided by a fellow gang member and intended to intimidate an inmate witness who reported a prior assault by the defendant.

So, I think I just read that as saying there's got to be some nexus, some connection between the conduct to be considered in the upward departure, and I wanted to make sure I have a sufficient factual record for that inclusion. I think what you're saying is I have the stipulation of the parties.

MR. SCOTTEN: I do also think you have a factual record. If you hadn't had it, we gave you an exhibit of the transcripts. You know factually what happened there. I think the question isn't lack of factual basis in the sense of the Court knowing what happened. I do think the Court has to make some conclusion that there is a reasonable relation here. I think I've offered that to the Court.

THE COURT: So what would you say is the test? You just said reasonable relation. Is that what you would say is the test?

MR. SCOTTEN: So, like your Honor, we tried to find

some authority on this that would give us an actual test, and I don't want to put specific words on it because I didn't find any authority that gave me those specific words.

I think the question is the parties have essentially agreed this is relevant conduct, and it is not adequately reflected in the guidelines. I think the Court's question really goes to relevant conduct. I think that it's not reflected in the guidelines is clear from the calculation. I think this does meet the test of relevant conduct because it comes out of the defendant's membership in the gang. I think his actions here are motivated by this tenet of the BMB membership, or at least explained in part by this tenet of the BMB membership, this anti-snitching policy. I think if the Court accepts it's relevant parties or at least the parties' stipulation that it's relevant conduct is reasonable, it has no reason to reject the stipulation.

THE COURT: Who will I hear from on this?

MR. GOLTZER: I will address it, your Honor, and I may address it in a way that may not be satisfactory to the Court because I find myself in a rather awkward and uncomfortable position, and it's this:

From the beginning, this was a very difficult case for Mr. Burrell on a lot of levels. He was placed, we think, inappropriately at the apex of what the government characterized as the largest gang take-down in the history of

the Republic.

We entered into very extensive negotiations with the government in good faith, and we think that they engaged in the same kinds of negotiations with us. They were not easy negotiations. There were contested matters of fact between the government and the defense, and we both tried to accommodate each other to reach what we felt would put the Court in a position to fashion an appropriate guideline sentence, variances aside for the moment.

We both have to be bound by whatever decision the Court makes on how it wishes to factor in this particular guideline. I want to be very candid with the Court and state that it may be somewhat academic because the guidelines are no longer mandatory. We are going to accept, obviously, whatever decision the Court makes with respect to this guideline. If the Court rules against us, we have stipulated out of appealing that issue, and we would not appeal that issue. So I want to put that on the table because I don't want to be in the position of breaching the plea agreement, even though the Court says a candid answer won't do that.

There was a fight. In fact, there were two fights. I don't think the government is going to contest that. There was a correction officer who observed Mr. Burrell fighting with the prospective witness in the other case. It is clear from that person's testimony that Mr. Burrell during the fight complied

with the order way back in January of 2017 to stop fighting and walk away, and he was the only person that did that. In fact, that was the second fight. There was an earlier fight between the prospective the witness and I believe the other gentlemen, that Mr. Burrell was not involved in.

To the extent that we have stipulated that the fight may have been in part caused by that person snitching, we're accepting that stipulation. We're not going to argue with that. To the extent that the government says that there was a preexisting conspiracy, we're not there.

To the extent that the organization or the gang or the enterprise, as do all of these enterprises in the streets of New York, have a view about so-called snitching, to the extent that the Court wants to accept that as somehow being relevant, we won't appeal that either. And I think that when the icing is scraped from the cake with respect to this very complex young man, there is a lot more to talk about than what caused this fight.

THE COURT: You're right, that was not satisfying.

MR. GOLTZER: My apologies. It's the best I can do.

THE COURT: It's also not wrong and -- I mean, at base, I think it is academic because the stipulated-to facts of this incident will be a part of my sentencing conclusion whether it's accounted for here in the guideline calculation or as a 3553(a) factor. I'm confident that whichever way I do

that, the ultimate sentence will come out to be the same, and I 1 am required to accurately calculate the Sentencing Guidelines. 2 3 MR. GOLTZER: I appreciate that, but the Court knows 4 I'm walking a tight rope here. 5 THE COURT: I do. And I sought your input with the assurance that your responses to my questions wouldn't be a 6 7 breach of the plea agreement, and you've given me that. So am I right that other than that issue, the 8 9 calculation contained in the PSR is in accord with the parties' stipulated calculation? 10 11 MR. SCOTTEN: I think so, your Honor. 12 THE COURT: That was lacking a certain level of 13 confidence. 14 MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor. It reads exactly the 15 same. THE COURT: Mr. Goltzer. 16 17 MR. GOLTZER: Yes. 18

THE COURT: And I presume then there are no objections to the calculation. Bracketing that issue, there are no objections to the calculation. Is that correct?

MR. GOLTZER: Yes.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SCOTTEN: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I do think that in light of the factual record established here, as well as the parties' stipulation to the applicability of the upward departure

pursuant to 5K -- and we'll get this right without the typo.

Let me just make one final point of clarification. The

government has represented that the plea agreement contained

the typo and the (a) was wrongly reflected I think as (d).

Mr. Goltzer and Ms. Vargas, you agree that what the parties intended to stipulate pursuant to with respect to this provision was 5K2.0(a)(2)(A)?

MS. VARGAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Just to finish the earlier sentence: In light of the facts contained in the presentence report, which I have adopted, in light of the parties' stipulation to this fact and my best reading of the available case law, I do believe it is appropriate to include this upward departure based on the aggravated assault on a witness in another federal case in light of the contention that this is sufficiently relevant conduct not adequately taken into account otherwise in the guideline calculation.

I, therefore, am going to, based on the parties' agreement, the absence of objection and my independent evaluation of the sentencing guidelines, I do accept the calculation contained in the parties' plea agreement. And for the reasons outlined in that plea agreement, I adopt that calculation process that's outlined in the parties' August 14, 2017 agreement. Accordingly, using the November 1, 2016 edition of the Sentencing Guidelines, the offense level here is

31, the Criminal History Category is III, and that produces a guideline range of 135 to 168 months.

I should note also that the parties agree that whatever sentence I impose pursuant to 5K2.23, the parties urge that I subtract the full amount of time that Mr. Burrell served for the 2009 conviction from the ultimate sentence here. Is that correct?

MR. GOLTZER: Yes.

MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor.

MS. VARGAS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And that is 66 months and some number of days. Is that right?

MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor.

MR. GOLTZER: Yes.

THE COURT: So other than the upward departure I found and the downward departure pursuant to 5K2.23 that I will include and calculate, I do not see any other basis for an upward or downward departure.

Is any further departure urged by the parties?

MR. SCOTTEN: No, your Honor.

MS. VARGAS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: As I've said, I've otherwise considered whether there's any additional basis for a formal departure from the advisory range within the guideline system and didn't find grounds warranting a departure under the guidelines. The

parties' plea agreement leaves them free to argue for a variance, and I think both sides do argue for a variance -- the defense for a downward variance and the government for an upward variance.

And with that, I will hear from you, Mr. Hagan.

Mr. Hagan, I'll hear from the government.

MR. SCOTTEN: OK.

So, your Honor, I'll be fairly brief.

THE COURT: I'm sorry, Mr. Scotten, I do that.

MR. SCOTTEN: Because my parents gave me a last name for the first name. Happens all the time, your Honor.

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. SCOTTEN: So I will be fairly brief.

You have our submission, and since our submission comes last, I don't think there's a lot of unaddressed points from the defense out there.

So I just want to stress a couple things. The first is that the government believes a sentence of 14 and a half years is appropriate here. We said that in our submission, but there are a couple points about that I want to stress. I think the Court is aware requesting an above-guideline sentence is not a step we take likely. It requires approvals a couple levels above the people sitting here. I think throughout this case we have been very reasonable in our sentencing requests, often pointing out when one defendant is like another, knowing

full well that will result in a below-guideline sentence because the Court has already applied a below-guideline sentence to the prior defendant, and generally taking the view that the Court's practice of sentencing, especially non-violent drug offenders to below-guideline sentences, that we've sort of accepted that and not disagreed with it as a systemic matter. I've talked to Ms. Maimin, we're not a hundred percent certain on this, but we believe it's the only time in this case we've asked for a variance.

THE COURT: I have upwardly varied once but not at the government's request.

MR. SCOTTEN: That is my recollection as well, your Honor.

I want to stress for reasons I'll get to in a minute and we've explored fully in our submission, we believe a 14 and a half year sentence is appropriate. I know sometimes some judges may feel "If we shoot here, hoping the Court will come a little bit below that." That is not the case here. We're not asking for 14 and a half years hoping the Court will decide 12 is appropriate. I understand the Court will make its own judgment.

Our view is the gravity of this defendant's offenses relative to the statutory count to which he has pled guilty are as severe as the Court might expect to see. There are, of course, worse crimes in the racketeering conspiracy, and the

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Court will sentence at least several defendants who have committed murders or more serious crimes than that; but within the realm of racketeering conspiracy, I think the harms the defendant has inflicted are remarkably severe.

The Court knows that the defendant shot two people; one of them innocent. And then went back to the gang life after shooting an innocent woman in the arm and failing to kill a young man, really, a boy, he chose to return to this gang and to lead it. I'm not going to go into more detail of the destructiveness of prescription opiates he sold, and I do think they fully warrant the guidelines, and that we are sort of going from there based on all the other crimes, but I do think the Court should hold the defendant accountable under Section 3553(a) for his leadership role in propagating violence, for coming back from prison saying, "I shot two people. Do what I do did; " for continuing to not only sell drugs but urging others to do so in his videos; and really for this wave of violence that overtook the community -- murders, shootings, stabbings, assaults. The Court has seen the consequences of this, and often I think that confronted with lower-level defendants who, to some extent, may have felt to the Court and certainly to themselves like they were caught up in something.

This is the defendant who founded that gang. If you want to see why that happened, it is sitting in the courtroom here today. It is this man who helped bring all that misery

into the community. And I'm not going to talk a lot more about all the crimes this Court has sentenced for, crimes which in some cases the Court might have felt the defendant sitting in that chair was to a degree a victim himself. To the degree those defendants were victims, they were caught up in something, this is the perpetrator of the crime against them as well.

What I think I want to stress before I sit down, maybe hit one more point, is another line from the defendant's videos, and one that is not in the PSR. We didn't stress it in our submission because on its face, it's not even that criminal. In one of the defendant's videos, he has a refrain where he talks about how he walks by other men, they don't talk; they just mumble. When he walks by regular people, people who aren't important members of the BMB like him, people who aren't feared gangsters, they can't hold their heads high. They can't meet him eye to eye. They can't talk to him. They're not his equal. They have to look down. That is the huge amount of damage this defendant did.

To stay in that community, if you want to be a big man if you want to be a proud person, if you want to hold your head high, you've got to be a part of this gang. If you're somebody who goes to work, who goes to school, who doesn't start fights, who doesn't sell drugs, you look down and you mumble. We're in charge of this neighborhood. Not you. That kind of

destructive behavior that can infect an entire community is a big part of what this Court should be punishing today.

And I suppose the last thing I would say —— I don't want to repeat it because I think we said it a lot in our sentencing submission, but, your Honor, as you hear this defendant speak today, as you hear his attorneys try to make the case that he's been rehabilitated in prison, I urge the Court to consider the fact that it's all been said before when he got a reasonable five-year sentence for an attempted murder and yet he came back out of it and started doing the same things again, when he came back out of that sentence and started selling drugs, carrying guns, making these videos and encouraging other people to repeat what he did, leading a gang that was in an ongoing war that resulted in multiple deaths.

I'm not going to tell the Court not to consider what these attorneys and this defendant say. Of course, it will.

But I do think the Court should constantly take it with a grain of salt, knowing those things have been said before and knowing all the havoc that ensued when the Court to some degree gave credence to them.

Subject to the Court's questions, I have nothing further.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Vargas.

MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, I'm going to address the

Court, but Mr. Goltzer would also like to address the Court.

THE COURT: I'm fine to hear from you both.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you, your Honor.

Your Honor, the first thing that I'd like to say in response to the government's statement just now is, in sum and substance, the government would like to implicate Mr. Burrell for every single act of violence that occurred in this case, except the one fact that they don't discuss is that Mr. Burrell was incarcerated from 2009, which was the supposed inception of this conspiracy up until 2014, for nearly six years, which is most of the duration of this conspiracy. And what's interesting, or what's curious, is that what they rely on to implicate all of this misery and all of this suffering that Nico Burrell allegedly caused this neighborhood are video statements. Video statements, your Honor.

We stated in our submission, we discussed this extensively, these were simply statements of expressions of art, expressions of speech, bombastic theater, if you will, and nothing more. And there's no evidence to prove otherwise.

There's no evidence to prove that because of these videos, therefore, 62 other defendants in this case went out and committed the violence that they committed. I say that's a stretch.

THE COURT: I do understand that point. And to the extent that I have considered comparable evidence in other

sentencings, I have essentially taken it for the proposition that it is an extolling of gang violence, a sort of glorifying and extolling of others to engage in gang violence and other illegal activity. I think it appropriate to consider it comparably here and not as proof itself that somehow Mr. Burrell, apart from what flows from his stipulation to a leadership role, is responsible for everything that occurred, right?

So, there's two facts. There's a fact he stipulated to a leadership role, and I've sentenced other leaders of the gang, particularly when there are acts of violence, to very substantial sentences because as some level the gang violence does flow from the leadership. So there's that fact. And the government has often, I think, tried to do a lot with it, but from my perspective, it's a sense of — it's at least a glorification of the violence and extolling the violence as sort of encouragement to others to engage in gang activity.

MS. VARGAS: Your Honor, no more than any other artists that are out there today that are engaging in the same type of videographic content, considered superstars in today's day and age, and utilizing the same type of hip-hop, rap music video content. Jay-Z is a perfect example of this. Snoop Dog.

THE COURT: But Jay-Z's -- they're not a leader of violent gangs.

MS. VARGAS: Who knows, Judge? What I'm saying is the

video in and of itself doesn't speak to much. Is Nico Burrell perhaps guilty of enjoying an inflated reputation by other children in his neighborhood who learned about how he did a five and a half year stint in jail for an attempted murder?

Yes, more than likely. But guilty of extolling violence because of something that he rapped on a video? Did he mimic other artists that were also engaged in the same type of artistry? Absolutely. Many artists in today's day and age. But extolling violence I think that is a lot to say for him, and I think it's misput. I think it is not an accurate assessment.

Mr. Burrell was incarcerated for five and a half years for the attempted murder shooting, which is a part of our stipulation -- which is relevant conduct, actually. We stipulated to that as relevant conduct.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. VARGAS: When he leaves the prison -- and this is the part that the government wishes the Court to consider as his most heinous period in his history of this conspiracy.

When he leaves the prison, he now comes home and starts doing these music videos. Yes, we are not disputing that in any way. We have the videos.

Do we like the music? We don't have to. Maybe some of us don't. But we don't have to like it. What we have to see it for is what it's worth. It's simply videos, which many

other Black artists, particularly Black artists who have come out of inner city neighborhoods like the one that Nico Burrell came from, many of them engage in this type of videographic content.

So I think that it's interesting that the government really hangs its hat on this because there is nothing else that they can hang their hat on. There is nothing else that they can say that Nico Burrell was doing in the two years that he was out.

THE COURT: Well, again, just to be clear, he stipulated to a leadership role.

MS. VARGAS: Yes, your Honor. We're not pushing back from the stipulations, as Mr. Goltzer just told the Court a few moments ago, but we have to put everything in perspective.

And the government would like -- the Court has to take the mandate and consider under the law the 3553 factors, but there is not just one factor to consider, and the Court would like it to simply be the nature and circumstances of the offense. There's more under 3553. And under 3553(a) it's nature and circumstances of the offense and history and circumstances of the defendant. That has to be considered as well in tandem with all the other factors. And we submit that if the Court takes everything into consideration, it cannot do as the government is asking.

First of all, with respect to what they are asking,

the government is asking for a variance. In a sentencing memo it is actually seeking an upward variance basing its request upon all of the conduct that we stipulated to as enhancements and upward departures, such as the four-point leadership role, which we are stipulating to and which we stand by, the two-point weapons enhancement, which we stipulated to and we stand by, and an upward departure to level 34 for the fight at MCC.

So the defense does take issue with the government's claim that it seeks a variance based on those factors because we believe that what the government is doing is indirectly seeking a forbidden guideline departure under the guise of a variance by using the stipulations that defense counsel entered into to raise the guidelines levels to essentially double count the stipulations. We believe that this is a violation of the spirit and letter of the plea agreement. And by way of example, the government should not be allowed to use the leadership enhancement twice, which is what it seems that it is doing in this case — once to gain a higher guideline range and the second time to achieve a variance, and this has been repeatedly done in the government's sentencing memo. Yes, we both agreed that either party could ask for a variance. Yes. That's on page 5 of the plea agreement.

THE COURT: I guess I do need to understand if you're contending that the government has breached the plea agreement,

and then if you are, we need to consider the possible --

MS. VARGAS: What we're saying, your Honor, is that what they are asking for violates the spirit of the plea agreement in that they are going above and beyond a variance. They are asking for a sentence starting at the max at 20 years and then asking for that sentence to be reduced by the 66-month departure. But the basis for that variance they're cloaking under the 3553 factors, although we stipulated to those enhancements that they are now calling 3553 factors.

THE COURT: I think we need to deal with whether you are making a formal assertion that the government has breached the plea agreement.

MR. GOLTZER: We are not stating that they have breached the agreement, your Honor. We are simply pointing out what the government is doing in its sentencing memorandum.

THE COURT: I guess I just want to make sure. So, for example, you do here, and in almost every sentencing proceeding I have, defense will argue for me to take into account the 3553(a) factors, the defendant's genuine acceptance of responsibility and remorse, right? I presume you do want me to take that into account in the 3553 factors, correct?

MS. VARGAS: Yes.

THE COURT: That's not a spirit breach of the plea agreement, is it, even though it's part of the stipulated to guideline calculation for a reduction of the calculation as a

result of that stipulation. Even though it's a sort of double counting of acceptance, I've never been asked to deem that a breach of the spirit of the plea agreement by the government even though almost every sentencing I encounter, the defense wants me both to formally calculate that into the guideline and take into account in varying below the guideline range.

MS. VARGAS: Except that in this case what the government is asking the Court to do is exclusively in their sentencing submission, they discuss his leadership, so, therefore, the Court should sentence him at the highest possible sentence because of his leadership role. We stipulated to the four-point leadership enhancement. Then they say because of the weapons in the case. We stipulated to the two-point weapons enhancement in this case. Then they talk extensively about the assault at MCC. Not only did we stipulate to an enhancement, it was up to a level 34 enhancement.

So it's not just that I'm saying, your Honor, please take into consideration his remorse. It's almost as if I were saying, your Honor, I would like you to please take into consideration the 5K2.23 downward departure, 66 months. But also I'm asking for another 66 months as a variance because of and I use the exact same reasons. That's not what we're doing here. We gave the Court an extensive sentencing memorandum outlining specific reasons as to why Mr. Burrell merits a much

lesser sentence. And when we entered into this plea agreement, we understood that the 66-level reduction — not that it was going to come from a sentence of 20 years. That's outrageous. We understood that the 66-level reduction was going to come from the stipulated guidelines range. In fact, that's what it says in the plea agreement. It is understood that the defense will ask for a downward departure from the stipulated guidelines range. And now it seems that because we filed a sentencing memorandum asking for a variance that now the government is asking for an even higher variance because of that, which we were absolutely permitted to do.

THE COURT: Yeah, I mean you're both permitted to do it by the tone of the agreement.

MS. VARGAS: We would like the Court to consider everything. We feel that in stipulating to the plea agreement, we have agreed to conduct; Mr. Burrell had never denied the conduct. He stipulated to the leadership role. He stipulated to the weapons. He was, in fact, convicted of an attempted murder in 2009, and he stipulated to the conduct that we just discussed extensively.

But there is more to Mr. Burrell than what the government would have the Court consider. Much more. He is not simply this guy who came out of jail, and he's rapping about videos and encouraging 63 other defendants to shoot people and commit the other crimes discussed.

We hired an independent expert, a professional former United States Probation and Pretrial Services officer who is now an expert in this field to conduct an in-depth investigation into Nico Burrell's entire history. And she wrote a comprehensive report, 14 pages practically single-spaced, where she concludes that based upon all of the factors in this case, the case included — that based upon all of those factors, including the offense, as I just said, as well as his difficult childhood and his incarceration which now spans 90 months, that Mr. Burrell has grown, is well on the path to rehabilitation and absolutely should be given the opportunity to continue on this path of learning and growth.

She states, and I quote, "Mr. Burrell has spent a total of 90 months -- 66 months in New York State Department of Corrections Prisons and 24 months in MCC detention -- behind bars, the past two years in harsh conditions of high security detention at the MCC. Based on his limited involvement in the conspiracy following his release from prison in 2014, his impressive rehabilitation efforts and what may be a once-in-a-lifetime chance of turning his passion for music into a lucrative career, further incarceration may not only be unnecessary to accomplish sentencing goals but may actually impede Mr. Burrell's continued rehabilitation and diminish his future prospects for leading a successful, law-abiding life. "This is coming not from his defense advocates. This is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

coming from a reputable expert, a professional, a former United States Pretrial Services and Probation officer.

Yet, the government does not seem to acknowledge any It will not acknowledge any of the difficulties in his life; the fact that in his preteen years, not one, but both of his parents were deported to Jamaica. He has never seen his mother again. And that was at the age of 13 or 14 years old. The government refuses to acknowledge that his stepfather, who was the only role model in his life after his father's deportation, has been serving since then a 27-year jail They will not acknowledge that. They will not acknowledge that this young man had been most of his entire life living in homeless shelters, including the weeks prior to when he was arrested on this case. They will not acknowledge any of the strides that he made while he was incarcerated in two of the most notoriously violent prisons in this state: Rikers Island, the embattled Rikers Island, where he spent two years at the age of 16. He was a child. They will not acknowledge that. Two more years and change at Clinton Correctional Facility, a notoriously violent prison, at the age of 18 when most of us at that age were looking to get into colleges.

They won't acknowledge any of the strides that he's made while incarcerated in the past 24 months. In fact, they appear to mock him in the sentencing memo. Yes, he is a

voracious reader. He has read an astounding 120 books, a fete that's incomparable for many of us, and, of course, yes, he has time in prison, but that's still something to acknowledge.

He participated in one of the most difficult-to-get-into programs in federal prison today, The Focus Forward Project, and he was one of the two valedictorian speakers at the graduation ceremony that I was actually fortunate enough to be allowed to attend because no one from the outside is ever allowed to attend these proceedings. And he's received certificates from other courses as well. I submitted those to the Court with our sentencing submission. He's mastered the game of chess. The government was mocking him about that as well. He's highly intelligent. He's highly motivated in every way to excel because he knows, and he accepts his past conduct, and he knows that what he did was wrong.

Now, the government says in its sentencing memorandum, well, that's true, but he was this grand leader. Well, why isn't it also proof that he has the capacity to rehabilitate; that he has the capacity to grow. His most serious offense is the prior conviction from 2009 for the attempted murder which the parties stipulated is relevant conduct. He served five and a half year prison sentence for that as a 16-year-old child.

So Nico Burrell has spent nearly the entire span of this conspiracy incarcerated, a conspiracy allegedly spent from

2009 to 2016. Correct me if I'm wrong. He was arrested in 2009. He spent five and a half years incarcerated. He was released in 2014, and re-arrested on this case in 2016. And when he was released, he threw himself into his passion, the same passion that the government would ask the Court to consider malevolent.

He's actually being sought after by record producers and recording studios and record labels for this malevolent music that has caused this misery according to the government. If it's so malevolent, why is he being sought after? It's prevalent in society this music, whether we like it or not.

So yes, the Court should consider the offense conduct. We've stipulated to the offense conduct, your Honor. And, yes, as your Honor stated, he is remorseful for his conduct. He has shown that. But the Court must also consider who is Nico Burrell — a 25-years-young man who spent more than a third of his life incarcerated. Yes, through his own actions, we don't dispute that, but that also has to be taken into consideration.

He's a young man who made a mistake, but he's acknowledged that mistake twice: Once in 2009 and then again two years ago when he pled guilty on this offense. He's not without hope, your Honor. He's well loved and staunchly supported by family and friends, most of which are here today. As you can see, the courtroom is filled. He is genuinely a good person.

Now, of course the Court could take this with a grain of salt, but we provided the Court with a stack of letters from friends and loved ones and family members who attest to his good character, and they know about his prior convictions and they know all about the charges here. We attached to our sentencing submission a video with statements from his aunt, she's here today, his sister, his grandmother, who is of ailing health, she is also here today. And from his manager, Sherwin Charles and from one of the producers of his videos, Alistair Christopher.

They all attest, all of them to his incredible work ethic, to his drive, to his ambition. And not only that, you have grown men talking in the videos that we submitted stating that he expresses his love to him. That is not the picture the government portrays but that is the other side that the Court should consider. He has demonstrated a fierce determination to change, your Honor. And we submit that he has. And not just now during his last two years of incarceration, but before his incarceration when he was released from state prison.

The government points to all of the videos as evidence, aside from what we stipulated to in the plea agreement, but there is another side to him. And that's why we're asking for the sentence we're asking for. It's not an unreasonable sentence, especially when considered with all the other sentences that the Court has handed down in this case. I

listed a few of the sentences in my sentencing memorandum.

Barffour Abeberse, number eight in the indictment, received a sentence of 102 months, though he's considered to be a much more violent offender in comparison to Mr. Burrell. That defendant was arrested with a loaded firearm, for which he was sentenced at state to probation and which he violated twice.

Mr. Burrell has been on parole and was never violated. That defendant participated in a shooting at a public housing project where he shot the victim in the calf.

THE COURT: He was on criminal justice supervision at the time of this arrest, correct?

MS. VARGAS: Yes, that's correct, your Honor.

The other defendant participated in the beating and robbery of a woman. Participated in a brawl that led to the murder of a 15-year-old. And sold crack and was found inside of an apartment where a .45 caliber pistol was recovered.

Mashud Yoda, number nine, his sentence was adjusted to 96 months. His conduct includes that he was a fugitive in this case. He was found hiding in Ithaca after an extensive government manhunt. He was also arrested where a search warrant was conducted and a pistol was recovered, and that pistol was tied to the murder of Keshon Porterfield in this case. He received a sentence of 96 months.

We believe that the sentence we're requesting would be fair in light of everything that we've presented to the Court,

including the conduct for which he's charged, and in light of all the other sentences that the Court has handed down, and the Court has the latitude and the discretion to do this, to impose a sentence that fits the crime and the person before the Court and to take into account Mr. Burrell's troubled background, his history and characteristics as well as his efforts at rehabilitation.

With that, your Honor, unless the Court has any further questions, I think Mr. Goltzer would like to address the Court.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Vargas.

MS. VARGAS: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. GOLTZER: Thank you, Judge.

I will not be as long as Ms. Vargas who has been taking the lead but there are some things that I would like to address.

One of the really guiding factors of my own career has been the work of Clarence Darrow. And I was reading some of the remarks that he made to a sentencing judge in the Leopold Loeb case back in the early part of the Twentieth Century when two gentlemen from very prominent and wealthy Chicago families engaged in a thrill killing for the fun of it, and everybody was clamoring for their death.

And what Darrow told the judge in substance was, before you can mete out justice to what is essentially a very

frail piece of human clay, you have to take a look at everything that's behind that frail piece of clay, the civilization, parents, the grandparents, all of the motivating factors. And if you can do it, said Darrow to the judge, who ultimately gave them life and not death, if you can do it, Judge, you're wise. And he concluded by telling the judge what I'm going to tell you. With wisdom goes mercy.

When I was appointed to this case, I was appointed as learned capital counsel because the government had promised that they were going to indict Mr. Burrell for a capital offense. He, unlike others in this case, has never been charged with murder. The government doesn't have a provable murder. And for the government to stand here and tell you that he is the worst of the worst, the worst defendant in this case is astounding to me.

MR. SCOTTEN: To be clear, we were very careful not to say that. The murderers haven't been sentenced.

THE COURT: You'll have a chance.

MR. SCOTTEN: OK, your Honor.

THE COURT: Go ahead, Mr. Goltzer.

MR. GOLTZER: What the government said in its memorandum that he is the worst who is to be sentenced. If the murderers haven't been sentenced, I'm unaware of that. He is not the worst of the worst to be sentenced in this case.

Quite the contrary. The Supreme Court recognized not

too long ago when it said you couldn't kill people who committed murders when they were under 18 years of age. The Supreme Court recognized the scientific studies that had been done about the status of the adolescent brain, and when he shot those shots in 2009 at the age of 16, his brain hadn't been fully developed. He lived a Dickensian childhood with every conceivable kind of deprivation, and it is no wonder that at that age when he wasn't fully developed emotionally or intellectually, he embraced a second family, which was the street.

And that's not a surprise to you. It's not a surprise to me, who's been on too many of these cases that that gang milieu, that gang culture takes these children in with the rap music and the culture I prefer Brahms, quite frankly. That culture is counterproductive. I accept that. The Court accepts it. But it is a fact of life. And he jumped in with both feet when he was 16 years of age, and it wasn't a reasonable sentence, I don't believe. There could have been supervision there could have been therapy.

Instead, there was warehousing of a young man who came out of prison in 2014 hardened, who went back out into the street and assumed a leadership role to the extent that he did extol them to live in the gang rap culture. He did extol them not to snitch, but I don't see evidence that he shot anybody after he got out of prison. I see evidence that he lived in a

homeless shelter, and he was able to sell a few pills, some number of pills because he had access to a source that the conspiracy was responsible for 8,000 pills but he was living in a homeless shelter and penniless supported by family and friends while he was trying to engage in a career as a musician.

And, yes, Ms. Vargas is right; they're mocking him for it. They're denigrating his intelligence. They're denigrating his leadership capacities. But it is that very capacity that has led him to be where he is at 25. And at 25 he's a heck of a lot different than he was at 16 or 18 or even 21 or than he was in 2016.

I told you before, your Honor, that when the corrections officer said "Stop fighting, walk away," he walked away. He not only walked away from the fight, but he walked away from that life. He's not the same person today that he was in January of 2017. If you accept what the government is saying about him, that everything he did to rehabilitate himself to show genuine remorse was phony, you'd have to believe he fooled everybody in this courtroom; that the people who wrote letters and told you that Nico Burrell took care of my special needs child, did good deeds in his life, tried to take care of his grandmother, took a homeless man on the street and gave him hope. You'd have to believe he fooled all those people. You'd have to believe the people who are here from the

Forward Focus group who wrote a beautiful letter on his behalf -- and they're sitting in the third row and smiling at me, your Honor -- you'd have to believe that those people who deal with prisoners every day and have seen every variety of con known to man were taken in by Nico Burrell.

And that's simply false. It is not true. And they're wrong about it. They have constructed a pyramid. They put Nico Burrell at the point of the pyramid, and they say he was the leader of the gang. Your Honor has already sentenced other so-called leaders of the gang. This isn't an enterprise with one leader. This isn't the Bonanno crime family or Gambino crime family.

This is a bunch of kids living in the hood, living a certain lifestyle that's counterproductive, and he's walking away from the it. That's what he's leading. He was rapping the life, but he wasn't telling people to kill anybody. Do you think he was sitting there in Clinton Correctional Facility or in Rikers Island telling people to go kill somebody? There's no evidence of that in this case, and yet they had him as the lead defendant, and that is why I was appointed. And I'm happy to say I didn't have to deal with a capital charge.

But if I had to deal with a capital charge, I have classic mitigation. Parents deported. A child deprived of his loved ones. A child living in poverty. A child being taken care of by a 19-year-old sister? Classic mitigation. It is a

miracle and a testament to the human spirit that he's able to climb out of it and have a future.

In terms of 3553(a), one has to look to general deterrence, specific deterrence. He's deterred. You think you're ever going to see him here again? No. He's done. He hasn't fooled all the people in this courtroom. And there is a difference — if I might take issue with something your Honor said. There is a difference between acceptance of responsibility and extraordinary or genuine remorse. I can get acceptance of responsibility by saving them the trouble of a trial, taking a plea, and the probation officer says give him three points. But that's not genuine remorse.

Genuine remorse is what's in your heart, and he feels genuine remorse, and you're going to hear from Mr. Burrell.

And he's not here to fool you, and he's not here to fool himself. He's changed. He will never be back in this courtroom again as a violator of the law. There's great hope for this young man. He's been rehabilitated. He's accepted responsibility. And more than that, he is remorseful for what he did. His letter is extraordinary. We didn't write it for him. And to mock his intelligence and to mock his leadership ability is wrong, and the government's wrong. And I respect these prosecutors.

THE COURT: I don't -- I'm not sure I know what you mean by mocking. It wasn't how I read it. I heard them

arguing that I should understand his intelligence and his leadership abilities as they contend he's used them, but --

MR. GOLTZER: Perhaps mocking is the wrong word. But to the extent that they denigrated it, I think it's inappropriate. I've seen too many young men who are intellectually disabled or who were what one would classify as antisocial personality disorders who were hopeless, who had limited prospects, who were dangers to the community, and they were very difficult to represent. And courts were tortured by what they had to do because there was a hopelessness surrounding them.

But that's not him. I am pleased to be able to tell you that you can have wonderful conversations with Mr. Burrell. There's a heart to Mr. Burrell. There's a lovingness to his family and friends about Mr. Burrell. That's why they're here. Look at this courtroom. It's a crowded courtroom. And Kathy O'Boyle wasn't fooled. Kathy O'Boyle spent how many years? I don't know how many years you spent, Kathy. I've known her for 25 years. She's seen it all. She was a probation officer. She was a pretrial officer. She's taught probation officers. He didn't fool Kathy O'Boyle. You can't con her. You can con me maybe, but you can't con Kathy.

So he's not coming back. He's been deterred. Nobody from the outside who looks at Nico Burrell and what he's been through in terms of his incarceration and the loss of his

family and the separation from his grandma, who is really one of the few people that he really cares so much about that he can't stand the fact he's been away from her. Everybody else has survived. No one who looks at that life at what he's been through now, he's been 90 months in jail, Judge. He's been in prison 90 months over this case.

THE COURT: You mean counting the 66 months.

MR. GOLTZER: That's right.

THE COURT: Here's the fundamental question,

Mr. Goltzer, which is that he commits the attempted murder in

2009. He's 16. He attempts to kill a rival gang member and

doesn't.

MR. GOLTZER: Well, he didn't attempt to kill --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. GOLTZER: It was unfortunate.

THE COURT: And in the course of it an innocent bystander. And that's obviously a very serious crime mitigated by his age.

MR. GOLTZER: I'm not minimizing it.

THE COURT: And that's part of his gang activity.

 $$\operatorname{\textsc{He}}$$  gets out in 2014 and then proceeds to be a leader of this gang.

MR. GOLTZER: Correct.

THE COURT: And in the course of that, there's obviously the extolling of the violence, but they're selling

drugs. The question is, is the carrying weapons referring to 2009 or is it activity after the 2014 release?

MR. GOLTZER: I believe that the government is probably contending that it's later, although I've seen no evidence of it, quite frankly. I do not know that there's ever been the seizure of a weapon or even a bullet or a knife from Mr. Burrell. There is an allusion in the incident in the prison to an allegation that he had some kind of object that he dropped but no one ever recovered it, and there doesn't appear to be the kind of injury that would have been caused by a knife or shank or a weapon. I don't see anything about weapons other than discussing them in videos, but I don't see anything that he ever carried a weapon after he came out of jail.

THE COURT: Let me just get an answer to that.

Is that stipulated conduct related to the 2009 incident?

MR. GOLTZER: That's my understanding.

MR. SCOTTEN: No, your Honor. In fact, to the contrary, the defense has already agreed the gun is after that time. That is paragraphs 7 and 7A of the plea agreement. You see, the gun is not connected to his gang membership in general. It is specifically connected to carrying that gun.

THE COURT: In furtherance of the oxy.

MR. SCOTTEN: Which he is dealing when he comes out of prison, so there should not be any dispute.

MR. GOLTZER: If I misspoke, I'll back off.

THE COURT: All right. So just thinking here. I wanted clarity on that point. So what we've got is this very serious crime happens. He's sentenced. He interacts with the criminal justice system. He comes out in 2014. And what he does is become a leader — or continues to be or is a leader of the BMB gang, which is a violent gang. He's selling oxy in furtherance of that conspiracy. He's carrying weapons in furtherance of that. He's extolling gang violence.

So whatever lesson you're saying he's learned now, he hadn't learned between 2014 and 2016 when he's incarcerated for this offense. Right? So the government says all of -- that's their version of it. And my question is, because you say none of these people can be fooled, but you can be, and the question is: What evidence do I look at to try to make this assessment? Is Mr. Burrell this changed person that you're talking about or does the record before me suggest five and a half years in prison didn't change him and even incarceration for this crime didn't change him because he assaulted a witness in another case during his pretrial incarceration? Those set of facts strongly cut the other way from the picture you're describing.

MR. GOLTZER: Let me address it. When he came out of prison in 2014, he had just spent over five years in a horrific environment which is not really designed as it originally was hoped it would be to rehabilitate. Anyone who thinks that

going to Rikers Island is going to rehabilitate somebody is somewhat naïve in our view. And Clinton is even more aggravated. I don't know if your Honor has ever had the privilege of looking at that wall in Dannemora, New York, but it's chilling, to say the least.

So when he came out with some status in the hood, if you will, and he started engaging in rap videos and tried to support himself by selling some pills, that's not unusual. That's not at all unusual. But he was not the apex of a pyramid. I think they're overstating that terribly. He did what he did. He was who he was. But that's not who he is now. And the fight that took place was in January of 2017. Many, many months ago. It's well over a year ago.

At the same time that this young man was doing what he wasn't supposed to do, the evidence seems clear that he was also helping people. You have that in the letters, Judge. He was doing decent things at the same time. He's a complex young man. Notwithstanding the deprivations that he suffered, he found it in his heart to help people and give them hope. And I don't think even the government would contradict that. No one is suggesting in this courtroom that the people who wrote those letters made it up.

The fact of the matter is that since January of 2017, there is nothing but an upward spiral in terms of his development and rehabilitation. And I think the Forward Focus

group is the perfect proof of that. Of all the people in that program, they chose two to be the valedictorian speakers, and Nico Burrell was one of them. So there is great hope here of redemption, and there is redemption. I believe in redemption. I hope the Court believes in redemption. You're going to hear from Mr. Burrell, and you will have a chance to judge the sincerity of his remarks.

And I hope you will find it in your heart to do what we think is the right thing and give him a sentence that gives him a chance to be who he is now and who can even be better. I went over his letter with him yesterday. He changed it a little bit the remarks he wants to make. He wants to be better than he is now, and now he's better than he was then, much better.

And to the extent that the government says or implies that this rehabilitation is a fraud, they're just wrong. And I don't think that it's remotely accurate to suggest that he was controlling in the sense of leadership 60 or 70 gang members. That's not what happened here. I don't think it was that sophisticated of an organization, that structured of an organization.

It was a neighborhood that was in pain that is still in pain, like so many neighborhoods in this City, like so many gangs in this City. He was part of it, he's sorry for it, and he's not going to be part of it again. But to give him a 20

year sentence with time off for the time that he already did, it's just inappropriate. It is just wrong. It is not what he deserves. It is not who he was. It is not who he is.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Goltzer.

Mr. Scotten, a couple of questions, and then I will give defense counsel any last responses, and then an opportunity for Mr. Burrell to make a statement.

One point that both defense counsel made was that for a situation portion of the conspiracy, Mr. Burrell is incarcerated. I think that ties to a broader question, which is that I would like you to point me to the facts. I mean, you talk about Mr. Burrell as a leader, and you do describe him as, I don't know if you would have said the apex, but your sentencing submission -- I don't want to misquote you -- started by saying, "Burrell is the most culpable defendant to come before the Court thus far in this case."

MR. SCOTTEN: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I guess I would like you to help me understand the government's position, put some flesh on the bones of what it means to have been the leader that he is stipulated to be. How do you understand his -- what's the basis for saying he's the most culpable, and what are the facts in the record that help put some flesh on the bones of his leadership role?

MR. SCOTTEN: Sure, your Honor.

So I think the best way for me to start with that is to just read from the PSR because, again, it's not a government assertion. I'm sure Mr. Goltzer didn't mean to contradict the PSR, and he just agreed it was accurate.

So I'm in paragraph 25, your Honor, which is on page 19. "After Burrell's release from state prison," skip the date, "Burrell acted as the head of BMB and made decisions for the gang, including giving leadership positions to gang members. "So we don't think there's a dispute that he's at the apex.

Now, I will agree with Mr. Goltzer, this is not a hierarchal organization like an organized crime family where some other gang member wants to do X, he has to send it up the chain, get Mr. Burrell's approval, and it comes back down. I agree that he did not have that type of control of the gang, and, frankly, that is the reason, your Honor, that he is not legally accountable for other murders and so on committed by the gang as a street boss of a Lucchese family, for example, might be.

What he did have was a position of authority such that all other members of the gang recognized him as the most senior, the person most respected. He was able to appoint other people to leadership roles. Does that lead to a trail of violence? Absolutely. Dominick Sherland, who murdered that

15-year-old boy the Court heard about in the defense's submission, was that person appointed to a leadership position in the gang by Nico Burrell? Yes, he was. Mr. Burrell recruited other members. That doesn't create violence in the same way that a direct order does, but it absolutely creates violence.

I'm overly formalizing, but essentially did he create policy? He never would have called it that. Certainly, the people who followed him wouldn't have. Yes. Was he the one who enforced or created norms such as no snitching, fight the other gang? Absolutely.

THE COURT: What paragraph do you point to for that proposition?

MR. SCOTTEN: So, paragraph 25 only says "made decisions for the gang." It does not specify which ones, but the preemptory paragraphs, the Court is very familiar with because they're in every PSR, describe what the major policies of the gang were. They also mention Mr. Burrell extensively. I think he's one of the few defendants to come before the Court. He was also mentioned in the preamble because he was that significant of a figure, so he's mentioned as a big suit who could create other big suits. He's mentioned as enforcing the Day One concept, that is the original core that can really be trusted, that won't snitch when the time comes that law enforcement comes. That's paragraph 17.

So I do think it is very much -- your Honor, you have a PSR that tells you what the gang did, what the defendant specifically did in many cases, and that he was the head that made decisions. I do think that's all in the record.

And I think the Court's question fairly gives me an opportunity to address this video issue. I don't want the Court to come away with thinking that videos are evidence of leadership. They are some evidence of leadership. Even Mr. Goltzer in his submission couldn't help but suggest that videos are part of what pulls people into these gangs.

And it's true, if we needed to have a hearing and call witnesses who could explain the powerful allure that you-too presence creates that directly brings people into the gangs and directly encourages rivalries, we can do that. But I think their better evidence of gang of what Mr. Burrell says. We're not having a Fatico, your Honor, so we're not going to put on cooperating witnesses to talk about what Burrell said. But you don't have to because you have these videos.

The one we sent you we chose because it was not a slickly produced video glorifying a fake robbery, which is a different video. It's just Burrell and other members of the gang and he's saying things that he would say elsewhere, that the PSR tells us he did: If we see an op, we shoot them. If we see a member of the opposing gang, we shoot them. We don't snitch. We don't even need a reason to shoot other people. My

gang, my blandirs, we're killers. We're shooters. We brag about bullets ripping through your tissue. I'm not saying that as someone who doesn't know. I'm not Jay-Z. I'm someone who sent some bullets through people's tissue a few years ago.

I suppose I should also note on that, your Honor, the fact Mr. Burrell was in the prison for sort of the middle of the conspiracy doesn't really take him out of influence. The conspiracy is actually charged starting in 2007 when Mr. Burrell was a very young man, but he was also founding the gang then. It's charged for a significant period of violence from 2014 to 2016 when he comes out. I don't see any evidence of remorse. I don't see Mr. Burrell coming forward to describe who killed Jordan Jaquette (ph), still an unsolved murder committed by the gang.

I have couple other points, but I know the Court had questions. I don't want to go into a free form rebuttal.

THE COURT: You did address it a little bit. I did want to ask the government, Ms. Vargas both in the submission and today pointed to individuals she thinks I should look to as comparables, and I always ask the government for that here.

MR. SCOTTEN: I don't really think you have that, your Honor. And the reason is, the Court has sentenced some leaders, but it didn't have a lot of violence, and it sentenced some very violent people but who were not leaders. The closest is McClarty. He hasn't been sentenced yet. If we had to

choose the second most leadership possessing person, that would be McClarty. Other than that, I'm not sure your Honor sentenced Anthony King.

THE COURT: I mean, Rasheid Butler, who was a leader of the Triple M subset, he had his underlying acts to which he pled for the RICO conspiracy included attempted murder of a rival gang member.

MR. SCOTTEN: We do think it's very important that he's a subset leader. I think the Court gave him a fairly significant sentence.

THE COURT: I sentenced him to 151 months.

MR. SCOTTEN: Right. He was in fact a leader of a subset of the gang, which makes him, I think, markedly less culpable than Mr. Burrell. Certainly very culpable, we're not arguing with the Court's sentence there. I'm sure we asked for more than that. But there's a difference between leading the entire gang and really being a sort of policy-setting figure as Mr. Burrell, someone who could appoint other leaders and make decision and being the violent leader of a subset of the gang.

THE COURT: I suppose that's true on a theoretical level, but I think it depends on how sort of loose and unstructured the structure of the gang was.

MR. SCOTTEN: Again, your Honor is right -- well, you know, if we were dealing with an organized crime family, and Mr. Butler was a captain and Mr. Burrell was the head, it would

be easier to parse that out. I guess the point here is that Burrell's actions served to influence throughout the entire gang. To the extent you are considering leadership in terms of things like making decisions to do terrible destructive antisocial things, Mr. Burrell's leadership authority is having wider impact than Mr. Butler. To the extent you're considering the founding of the gang and the appointment of other leaders, Burrell can have a much wider influence. He's still at the top, even if he is not the top in an org chart kind of way, his influence is still significantly greater than Butler's.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. SCOTTEN: The other couple points I want to make very quickly, your Honor, I am not going to belabor the point about the facts because I think the Court has it. There are a lot of facts that show no rehabilitation, continuous return to violence. I'm not mocking or denigrating any of the facts that show talent, ability, motivation. I just think that's all the Court has actually seen. And I think that was always there from the beginning.

I don't think there's any evidence, not an ounce of Mr. Burrell getting out of jail and abandoning the gang life. Yes, he helps his family, his friends. He's inspirational., he would hardly be the first criminal leader to come before this Court who took care of his family, who looked out for his friends, who inspired people. That's part of what a good

leader is. People follow good leaders. I'm not denying
Mr. Burrell is a good leader. But so far he has shown
repeatedly he will put that to terribly destructive ends, and I
do think the Court should consider that.

The last two points, your Honor, I want to make sure the record is clear on this assault that occurred. It keeps getting referred to as a fight. It's not a fight. I think we gave the Court the testimony. The testimony describes the video. We decided not to put a video in evidence and also not to argue about that. But in short what happens is the victim is seen at a phone bank. The other member of the assault, the second person, passes by Burrell, signals to him "Come on. Let's go get this guy." And then two men attack one man. They begin beating him. The guards intervene. And, yes, Burrell freezes.

After -- you can see this on the video and it's described in testimony we gave the Court. After, he very carefully turns to another inmate and throws him an object.

Reasonable decision? Yes. Evidence of rehabilitation? No.

And then finally, your Honor, this is not 3553(a) factor, but I want to make it absolutely clear. The government's current understanding of the parties' position is that both parties are allowed to make the arguments they made today and that neither party believes the other would be in breach. I want to be very clear about that and give the

defendants any opportunity they want to try to get

Mr. Burrell's plea back because now is the time to do it; not
after a sentence is imposed.

MR. GOLTZER: May I have two minutes?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. GOLTZER: Thank you.

I would like to pose a rhetorical question to the Court. If the government is right that Mr. Burrell was the leader of the pack, how could it be that from 2009 to 2014 this loose enterprise was able to function in his absence? How could it be that people were getting shot; that crack, which he never pled to was being sold; that people were being recruited; that policies were being made? How could it be that any of that could have happened without the kingpin?

It's obvious that this gang or this loosely put-together enterprise was fully capable and did function without Mr. Burrell for years and then to the extent that the government needs Carlo Gambino, they've chosen Mr. Burrell and this other fellow. But it's a fable. There's no evidence of it. They have a snitch.

MR. SCOTTEN: I think we may need a hearing.

MR. GOLTZER: We don't need a hearing. The government has had every opportunity to put in whatever it wanted to put in, and what's in the presentence report, the PSR in terms of the narrative, is the government's version of events. We're

not arguing that he wasn't a leader. We've addressed that, but they've overstated it.

THE COURT: Unless you are asking for a hearing, it's no longer just the government's version of events. It's the factual record which I've adopted for purposes of the sentencing proceeding.

MR. GOLTZER: And I mentioned to the Court, and I say this most respectfully, there is leadership and then there's leadership, which you've sentenced several leaders. There are other leaders in the case.

THE COURT: I get that, but in terms of the facts I rely on to make an assessment of what his role as a leader is, you're not asking for a factual hearing.

MR. GOLTZER: No. But I'm saying, and I think it's accurate, that they have overstated it. The government just said it's a loose -- it's loose. Did I hear that correctly? I think I heard that correctly.

THE COURT: Yeah.

MR. GOLTZER: That it is not as hierarchal as the Lucchese crime family. It's just not the same. To the extent that they allege these gangs are enterprises, that's fine, we understand that. To some extent, they're loose.

THE COURT: Again, not just alleged; pled to here.

MR. GOLTZER: I understand that.

THE COURT: I want the record to be clear.

MR. GOLTZER: I'm not backing off, but as I mentioned earlier, when we were addressing questions about the report, there are degrees and there are nuances and it's being terribly overstated and what's being terribly understated by the government is his rehabilitation and the fact that he's changed. That's all I'm saying. And that's all I want the Court to know, and I hope you accept that.

THE COURT: I do. Mr. Goltzer, I do want to be clear, I think we have a clear answer to this, but if there is any contention that the government has breached the plea agreement, now is the time to make that contention and make any request with respect to that.

MR. GOLTZER: No, there is not. We think that their argument is misguided, but that's a different issue. But as far as a legal conclusion of breach, we're not going there.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you.

MR. GOLTZER: Thank you.

THE COURT: With that, Mr. Burrell, I have read your letter, sir, but I want to give you an opportunity to make a statement here in court. You don't have to, but if you'd like to, you may do so now.

THE DEFENDANT: Good morning, Judge Nathan.

First I want to tell you the steps I did when I started making music. I started writing music in 2013 in Bain Correctional Facility. When I came home to find my music in

2014, I took that music to my manager. My manager been managing people that does music. He took the music and brought it to a producer. That producer looked me in my face and told me, "If you rap like this, I could give you a million dollars like Jay-Z. I could get you a million dollars like Rick Ross. I could give you a million dollars like Meek Mill. I know my lyrics is not good. My lyrics is not positive. But that was the material that was being made at the time. That's the material that I looked at the You Tube, and they gained a million views.

Now I got a chance. I got a million views on You

Tube. I got the record labels asking to ask when I'm coming
home, and when I'm coming home, I would like to sign him. This
is my chance off of that music. So I know that you don't
understand. The ADA don't understand why the music is violent
or why I choose to rap that way, but that's why I did it.

Jay-Z got locked up for aggravated assault and drugs, but he
still rapped and overcame that, and that's what I want to do.

But I want wrote something I want to read to you that's in front of me.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

THE DEFENDANT: When my mom got deported, it hit me like a ton of bricks.

I was a 15-year-old boy who thought I was a man, but made poor decisions and made excuses for my actions. And even

though I was supposed to be there for my family at the time they needed me the most, I let them down by going to jail.

Well, I'm no longer that person. And I haven't been since I was 18-years-old. My name been dragged through mud from the news and ADA at bail and sentencings and hearings making me a character out of the latest gangland book even though I only been locked up one time in my entire life, and even though I only been home 20 months in the last nine years, or even that I maintained -- and maintained a crack spot when I was living in a shelter and sleeping on my sister's couch,

Judge Nathan, I came back from my six-year bid and took my pain and frustration and put it into my music to make something out of myself. To erase the feeling of feeling like a disappointment. To erase the feeling that I gave up on my family and disappointed my family.

It excites me when I hear my manager tell me that a major record label wants to sign me or when I hear my music on the radio. It makes me feel proud of myself. That I could finally use my music to get my family out of cursed situations, like my grandmother not being able to afford medicine or my aunt getting laid off from her job because she can't pay the rent.

But I'm locked up again, Judge Nathan. I hear y'all ask what's the difference between now and five years ago -- five and a half years ago. The difference is my grandmother is

about to leave me, Judge Nathan, and I can't help her right now. I can't even give her a kidney right now if I wanted to. I can't. Judge Nathan, give me a chance, man. Give me a chance to prove everybody wrong. Give me a chance to be a brother to my sisters, a cousin to my cousins, an aunt to my nephew -- a nephew to my aunt, a grandson to my grandmother, a son to my mother, an uncle to my nieces, and most important, my nephews so they don't have to know what an MCC cell looks like. They don't have to go running to the street for guidance and love like I did growing up at 16-years-old, Judge Nathan. Give me a chance to take my family out of poverty and break the cycle that been bringing us down these last 12 years.

I made some mistakes, and, Judge, that's in my past.

And I want to say I'm sorry for what I did to my family, to the community, to the Court. I grown out of it. I grown out of that crazy part of my life. I'm now who I am, and I hope to be better than I am. Judge Nathan, I'm just asking for a chance.

Thank you very much.

THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Burrell.

Counsel, anything further? Any reason why sentence cannot be imposed at this time?

MR. SCOTTEN: No, your Honor.

MR. GOLTZER: No, your Honor.

MS. VARGAS: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: As I've stated, the guideline range applicable to this case is 135 to 168 months' imprisonment. Under the Supreme Court's decision in *Booker* and its progeny, the guideline range is only one factor that the Court must consider in deciding the appropriate sentence.

I'm also required to consider the other factors set forth in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). These include the nature and circumstances of the offense, and the history and characteristics of the defendant, the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, to promote respect for the law, and to provide just punishment for the offense, to afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, to protect the public from further crimes of the defendant and to provide the defendant with needed vocational or educational training, medical care or other treatment.

I am to take into account the kinds of sentences available, as I said, the guideline range, any pertinent policy statement, and the need to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities among defendants with similar records who have been found guilty of similar conduct.

I am required to impose a sentenced sufficient but no greater than necessary to comply with the purposes I've just described.

I have given substantial thought and attention to the appropriate sentence in this case in light of the 3553(a)

factors and the appropriate purposes of sentencing as reflected in that statute.

Mr. Burrell stands convicted of an extremely serious offense. He pled guilty to participating in the racketeering conspiracy. He was the leading member of the violent street gang BMB that operated in the Bronx. BMB trafficked in narcotics including oxycodone, crack cocaine, marijuana and other prescription pills. Members of the gang and associates kept firearms and engaged in acts of violence, including shootings, stabbings and assaults. BMB has a violent cultural norm against snitching or cooperating. This gang ravaged the areas it occupied with its dangerous drugs and violence. It did real damage to the neighborhood.

As noted, Mr. Burrell was the leading member of this gang. His first major act took place in 2009 when he shot a rival gang member. And in the course of that shooting, an innocent bystander was also shot. He faced punishment. He interacted with the criminal justice system and faced punishment for that. He was sentenced to five and a half years of prison.

Upon his release, he did resume his BMB activities, as it states in paragraph 25 of the PSR. After his release from prison in 2014, Mr. Burrell acted as the head of BMB and made decisions for the gang, including giving leadership positions to gang members. His activity individually included selling

narcotics, carrying weapons. He led the gang and he extolled the violence of the gang, and in the course of doing so fostered the gang culture of enforcement against snitches and rival gang violence.

I want to be clear, I am not sentencing Mr. Burrell for his music and for his expression contained in that music. I appreciate Mr. Burrell's talent, and I recognize that the music he creates and makes has an expressive element, and he's not being punished for that. But I do take into account in conjunction with the stipulation to the leadership role that there was a fostering and extolling of the violent gang culture that is communicated by Mr. Burrell during the course of some of that activity and other.

It's difficult to not take as a significant fact that despite the punishment he received in 2009 and serving five and a half years for that, that he returned to the gang and continued in a leadership role which does suggest the need for a very substantial punishment.

Also very concerning is that even upon incarceration here for this instant offense, the violent activity did continue, and he committed an aggravated assault in prison against someone who is a witness involved in a separate federal prosecution, seemingly acting out on the gang culture of engaging in acts of violence against cooperators, which is very troubling.

I indicated that I was including that in my guidelines calculation. I said it before and I'll say it again, I want to make clear even if I hadn't, I would take it into account as part of the 3553(a) factors.

Mr. Burrell, it's interesting — as you just said,
Mr. Burrell, you don't have an extensive criminal history, you
were incarcerated for your other known conviction at the age of
16, and you served five and a half years. You didn't have a
lot of time between your release there and incarceration here,
so it's hard to know what to make of that record, except two
things: It's not an extensive criminal history, to be sure,
but the criminal history that exists is both extremely serious
and didn't serve as a sufficient deterrence to your leadership
involvement in the gang activity here.

Given Mr. Burrell's leadership of this destructive gang, the level of violence that Mr. Burrell has himself participated in, the extolling of the violence of the gang and the continuation of violent activity after prior incarceration and even after incarceration here, I have no doubt that a very serious sentence is warranted to protect the public, to impose just punishment, to promote respect for the law and to deter Mr. Burrell and others.

Of course I must, and I do, take into account the history and characteristics of this defendant. Mr. Burrell pled guilty and has accepted responsibility for his conduct.

He's obviously faced substantial obstacles and difficulties during the course of his young life, better discussed at length in the mitigation report and the defense submission and as discussed here today, obvious tremendous instability and separation from loved ones following the deportation of his parents and the difficult life circumstances of homelessness and the like.

He has made admirable efforts at rehabilitation during incarceration here. At least there's indications of that:

Involvement in a variety of programs, including Focus Forward and obviously seen by the facilitators of that program who've written me and who are here today as someone with leadership ability and potential. He's obviously a very bright young man with leadership ability. He's well read. You've read more than me in the last couple of years, Mr. Burrell, and I'm glad to see it. You're a bright man, and that intelligence is reflected both in your writing, in your speaking, obviously in your speaking ability that was identified by the Focus Forward program, and in the writing that constitutes your music.

The question going forward, the fundamental question here is whether Mr. Burrell will use those leadership abilities, those skills, his intelligence as he has in the past toward criminal conduct and criminal organization or toward creating a better life for himself and his community. It's a mixed record. Obviously, there are indications from the

letters I've received and the steps taken in incarceration that those skills can be put to good use, but for the reasons I indicated earlier, there are troubling facts which suggest that if that real change has come, it has come only very recently and not after prior incarceration and not even after incarceration here. But I do take those facts into account.

I will sentence Mr. Burrell to avoid unwarranted sentence disparities. I think it's right to say that he is different than many of the defendants I have sentenced.

There's violence here, which is of great concern to me, although it was when he was only 16, but I'm obviously concerned about whether it's the apex or not, the high level of leadership in the gang that's been stipulated to, and I think it does at least make him comparable with someone like Rasheid Butler who I sentenced and others who helped facilitate the gang in important ways who provided leadership, who set policies, who extolled violence and enforced that cultural norm.

I reject the government's request to sentence with an upward variance. I don't believe that the record here significantly establishes a level of culpability that well beyond others who I've sentenced, and I think there is more of a glimmer of hope that the rehabilitation that's been presented can be real and actualized in the future.

I also reject the defense's request for a downward

variance. I actually think here that the guideline range appropriately captures the level of culpability as well as the history and characteristics of the defendant that come together with a complicated and quite mixed picture with uncertainty as to the future but the possibility, as Mr. Goltzer said, of redemption.

But the punishment must be sufficient in light of the level of violence, the leadership role, the destructive nature of this gang, the extolling of violence and the continuation of violence that has occurred despite incarceration and prior punishment. In sum, I have concluded that a guideline sentence is appropriate for the reasons that I've indicated. I will upon stating my sentence subtract the approximately 66 months for time served pursuant to 5K2.23.

Mr. Burrell, I will ask you to please rise as I state your formal sentence. It is the judgment of this Court that you be sentenced to a period of 150 months, that's one five zero, to be followed by a period of three years of supervised release, and I will, as I said, subtract 66 months for time served pursuant to 5K2.23, which produces a sentence of approximately 84 months, to be followed by a period of three years of supervised release.

You may be seated, sir.

During your term of supervised release, the standard conditions of supervision shall apply.

In addition, you will be subject to the following mandatory conditions: You shall not commit another federal, state or local crime.

You shall not unlawfully possess a controlled substance.

You must refrain from any unlawful use of controlled substance and submit to one drug test within 15 days of release from imprisonment and to periodic drug tests as determined by the court and probation.

As I said, you must comply with the standard conditions of supervision which are outlined on pages 39 through 40 of the PSR.

In addition, you will be subject to the following special conditions:

You will be subject to the search term that's outlined on page 40 of the PSR. Specifically, you must submit your person, residence, place of business, vehicle, and any property or electronic devices under your control to a search on the basis that the probation officer has reasonable suspicion that contraband or evidence of violation of the conditions of your supervised release may be found.

Also, as indicated in the PSR, I'm imposing a special condition that you enter and complete an education and/or vocational training program, which includes preparation for the GED and as directed by the court and probation, and I will pay

attention during your period of supervision to both education and employment.

I do recommend that you be supervised this your district of residence.

I will waive the fine because I don't believe that you have the ability to pay the fine.

I am imposing a mandatory special assessment of \$100  $\,$  which shall be due immediately.

Does either counsel know of any legal reason why the sentence should not be imposed as stated?

MR. SCOTTEN: No, your Honor.

MR. GOLTZER: No, Judge.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: The sentence as stated is imposed.

I do find that the sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to satisfy the sentencing purposes that I described earlier.

As I indicated, and I will just state formally, that even had I not imposed the upward departure pursuant to 5K2 -- who can remind me?

MR. SCOTTEN: I think it is 5K2.0 --

THE COURT: 5k2.0(a)(2)(A).

MR. SCOTTEN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Even if I had not imposed the upward departure pursuant to that, I would have arrived at the same sentence pursuant to the 3553(a) factors.

Mr. Burrell, when you are released and on supervised release, you will have the guidance and support of the probation department. As you reestablish your day-to-day life during your period of supervised release, please take advantage of these resources as the people in probation are committed to helping you succeed.

That said, I must caution you that you must comply strictly with all of your conditions of supervised release. If you are brought back before me for a violation of those conditions, I may sentence you to another term of imprisonment, and I hope and expect you won't put me to that decision.

Counsel, are there any requests regarding designation and the like?

MR. GOLTZER: Yes, your Honor. We would request that you recommend to the Bureau of Prisons a designation to a facility as close as possible to the Metropolitan New York area to facilitate further contact with family and friends.

THE COURT: I do make that recommendation for placement in a facility as close to New York City area as possible to help facilitate maintenance of ties with Mr. Burrell's family.

Mr. Scotten, are there any remaining counts or underlying indictments that need to be dismissed at this time?

MR. SCOTTEN: There are, your Honor, and the government moves to dismiss them.

THE COURT: They are dismissed. 1 2 Mr. Burrell, I'm required to inform you of your 3 appellate rights. To the extent you have not given up your right to appeal your conviction and your sentence through your 4 5 plea of guilty and the agreement that you entered into with the government in connection with that plea, you have the right to 6 7 appeal. 8 If you are unable to pay the cost of an appeal, you 9 may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis, meaning you 10 don't have to pay any filing fee. The notice of appeal must be filed within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. 11 Counsel, is there anything else that I can address at 12 13 this time? 14 MR. SCOTTEN: Thank you, your Honor. No. 15 MR. GOLTZER: No. Thank you, Judge. 16 MS. VARGAS: No, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: My thanks to counsel for their advocacy. 18 Good luck to you, Mr. Burrell. 19 We're adjourned. 20 (Adjourned) 21 22 23 24 25